Report title	**GHG Emission Report, v1.1**
Indicator	**1.21.4**

Instructions

This template is intended for reporting greenhouse gas emissions results to ASC. The Feed Standard does not prescribe a specific standard or set of methods for generating GHG values. However, suppliers should be aware that the development of the Farm Standard requirements may necessitate the application of specific methods for feed emissions in the future.

Emissions can be reported in either or both columns using a biophysical or economic allocation approach. Emissions results must be provided according to scope (1-3) as well as by input/activity, being general feed ingredient categories and additional transport and milling emissions that aren't otherwise captured within ingredients. 'Transport and milling' emissions should be at least equal to the sum of scope 1 and scope 2 emissions. If possible, emissions should also be broken down by category (fossil, biogenic, or land use change), facilitated by certain databases and assessment methods. Any uncategorized emissions should be reported as 'Unspecified emissions' (If feed suppliers are unable to determine emissions by category, the total of all emissions can be reported as unspecified).

This template is also expected to reflect the resolution of data that feed suppliers will need to provide to farms to satisfy feed-related emissions modeling for the Farm Standard. Feed suppliers should be ready to adjust the composition of ingredients used in calculations to reflect typical compositions of feeds relevant to each producer, whether that is on a producer-level or a general species-level (e.g. average ASC-compliant salmon feed composition), so that relevant emissions estimates are available to aquaculture producers for their own calculations.
Only enter data in blue cells.

Table 1. Production year

Year of production (yyyy)	2025

Table 2. GHG emissions by scope

GHG emissions per tonne of ASC compliant feed (kg CO_2-eq/t)

Emissions scope	Biophysical (mass) model	Economic model
Scope 1	21,11451551	21,11451551
Scope 2	77,53420842	77,53420842
Scope 3	446	482,4891195
Total	545,0833885	581,1378434

Table 3. GHG emissions by category

Emissions category	Biophysical (mass) model	Economic model
Fossil emissions		
Biogenic emissions		
Land use change emissions		
Unspecified emissions		
Total	0	0

Table 4. GHG emission by Input / Activity

Input / Activity	Quantity (kg/t)	Biophysical (mass) model	Economic model
Soy crop inputs	313	190,48	197,09
Other crop inputs	259	140	166,5430399
Reduction fishery inputs	25	30	31,88253717
Fishery by-product inputs	60	53	54,02150239
Poultry / livestock inputs	0	0	0
Other feed inputs	342	19	19,0183963
Transport and milling		112,578723930225	112,5787239
Total	1000	545,0834142	581,137968

Notes

All emissions values must be reported in units of kg CO_2-equivalent per tonne of ASC compliant feed.

Emissions totals for each section should be equivalent.

Total feed input quantity (kg/t) must equal 1000. Use 'Other feed inputs' to make up any difference from 1000 kg. 'Other feed inputs' should also

Transport-related emissions may be difficult to separate from ingredient production and processing emissions, depending on the data source used.

VITAPRO

INGREDIENTS LIST >1%

Indicator 2.2.3|2.2.4

Ingredient	Raw Material	Country Origin
Fish Meal	Whole Fish	Mexico
Fish Meal	Aquaculture Fish	Honduras
Fish Oil	Aquaculture Fish	Honduras
Soy Meal	Soy	United States
Wheat	Wheat	United States
Wheat Bran	Wheat	United States

Report title Due Diligence Pathways and Low Risk Plant Ingredients Report, v1.0
Indicators 2.2.10 and 5.1.12

Instructions

This template is intended for reporting both a) outcomes of the Due Diligences carried out under Principle 2 and the respective pathways to ASC, and b) an overview of plant ingredients determined to be low risk under Principle 5 and the respective pathways chosen. Reporting is at a UoC level and on an annual basis.
The UoC should select the type of assessment (whether ingredient manufacturer or plant/marine primary raw material), noting that 'plant primary raw material 5.1.5' refers to the additional due diligence assessment required under Principle 5 for legal deforestation/conversion.
The UoC enters the date the assessment was conducted.
The UoC selects the primary raw material assessed (if applicable). If primary raw material is not lised, the UoC enters the common name and latin name.
The UoC selects the country of location (ingredient manufacturer) or production (plant primary raw material). For marine primary raw material, the country of the flag state is used (as per pathway 1 Country Score Card), unless pathway 2/3/4 are chosen in which case 'Fishery' is selected as the Country of location.
The UoC selects which pathway was chosen to demonstrate low risk for each risk factor (legal, social and environmental). For plant primary raw material 5.1.5 assessments, only the environmental risk factor applies.
A new row should be added for each assessment.
Only enter data in the blue cells.

Table 1. Total number of assessments

Type of Assessment	Pathway 1	Pathway 2	Pathway 3	Pathway 4	Total
Ingredient Manufacturer (2.2.5)	9	0	0	6	15
Marine Primary Raw Material (2.2.6)	0	0	0	3	3
Plant Primary Raw Material (2.2.6)	6	0	6	0	12

Table 2. Outcomes due diligence pathways and low risk plant ingredients report

Type of Assessment	Date of Due Diligence Assessment (yyyy-mm-dd)	Primary Raw Material "common name (latin name)"	Country of location/production (select 'Fishery' if not using Pathway 1 for Marine)	Pathway chosen to demonstrate Low Risk for Legal risk	Pathway chosen to demonstrate Low Risk for Social risk	Pathway chosen to demonstrate Low Risk for Environmental risk
Ingredient Manufacturer (2.2.5)	2025-12-31	n.a.	Mexico	Pathway 4 - Certification	Pathway 4 - Certification	Pathway 4 - Certification
Marine Primary Raw Material (2.2.6)	2025-12-31	Fish	Mexico	Pathway 4 - Certification	Pathway 4 - Certification	Pathway 4 - Certification
Ingredient Manufacturer (2.2.5)	2025-12-31	n.a.	Honduras	Pathway 4 - Certification	Pathway 4 - Certification	Pathway 4 - Certification
Ingredient Manufacturer (2.2.5)	2025-12-31	n.a.	United States	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card
Plant Primary Raw Material (2.2.6)	2025-12-31	Soy	United States	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card
Plant Primary Raw Material (5.1.5)	2025-12-31	Soy	United States	N/A	N/A	N/A
Plant Primary Raw Material (2.2.6)	2025-12-31	Wheat	United States	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card
Ingredient Manufacturer (2.2.5)	2025-12-31	n.a.	United States	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card
Plant Primary Raw Material (2.2.6)	2025-12-31	Wheat	Honduras	Pathway 3 - Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Pathway 3 - Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Pathway 3 - Ingredient Manufacturer assessment
Ingredient Manufacturer (2.2.5)	2025-12-31	n.a.	United States	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card	Pathway 1 - Country Score Card
Plant Primary Raw Material (2.2.6)	2025-12-31	Wheat	Honduras	Pathway 3 - Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Pathway 3 - Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Pathway 3 - Ingredient Manufacturer assessment

Report title Sectoral/fishery Assessment or Ingredient Manufacturer Assessment Summary Report, v1.0

Indicator 2.2.11

Instructions

This template is intended for reporting a summary of Due Diligence pathways 2"sectoral/fishery assessment" or 3 "ingredient manufacturer assessment" under Principle 2. Reporting is at a UoC level and on an annual basis.
The UoC should select the pathway used and the type of assessment (whether ingredient manufacturer or plant/marine primary raw material).
The UoC enters the date the assessment was conducted.
The UoC selects the primary raw material assessed (if applicable). If primary raw material is not lised, the UoC enters the common name and latin name.
The UoC selects the risk factor assessed.
The UoC selects the country of location (ingredient manufacturer) or production (plant primary raw material). For marine primary raw material, 'Fishery' is selected as the Country of location.
The UoC selects the FAO fishing area for the marine primary raw material.
The UoC enters a summary description of the risk assessment (max 1500 characters).
The UoC enters links to any publicly available resources used.
The UoC enters a summary description of any measures taken to ensure low risk (for ingredient manufacturer assessment only) (max 1500 characters).
The UoC enters a summary description of implemented monitoring program to a) measure the effectiveness of any measure taken to ensure low risk (if applicable) and b) monitor the risk factors, or indicators for the risk factors, to ensure the risk level determined remains valid (max 1500 characters)

A new row should be added for each assessment and for each risk factor assessed (if more than one).

Table 1. Summary of due diligence pathways 2 and 3 report

Pathway used	Type of Assessment	Date of Due Diligence Assessment (yyyy-mm-dd)	Primary Raw Material "common name (latin name)"	Risk Factor Assessed	Country of location/production (select 'Fishery' if Marine primary raw material)	FAO Fishing area (if Marine primary raw material)	Summary description of risk assessment (max 1500 characters)	Links to any publicly available resources used	Summary description of any measures taken and their effectiveness (max 1500 characters)	Summary description of implemented monitoring program (max 1500 characters)
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Legal	United States		Risk Assessment Summary A sector-level (Pathway 2) risk assessment was conducted for soy produced in the United States, differentiating two regions: Corn Belt: classified as a low-risk area, given that over 97% of the area planted with soy corresponds to agricultural land established prior to 1990, with no evidence of deforestation or conversion after 2020. Great Plains: classified as a moderate-risk area, due to documented conversion of native grasslands over recent decades, albeit under state legal frameworks (legal conversion). ii. Risk Assessment Outcome (risk by factor) Legality: Low risk (compliance	Normativa internacional y estándares • Aquaculture Stewardship Council. (2023). ASC Feed Standard V1.01. Utrecht, Países Bajos: ASC. • FEFAC. (2021). Soy Sourcing Guidelines 2021. Brussels, Bélgica: European Feed Manufacturers' Federation. • ProTerra Foundation. (2025). ProTerra Standard v5.0. Rotterdam, Países Bajos: ProTerra Foundation. • RTRS – Round Table on Responsible Soy. (2021). RTRS Standard for Responsible Soy Production. Buenos Aires, Argentina: RTRS. • ISCC. (2023). ISCC PLUS Sustainability Requirements. Cologne, Alemania: ISCC System GmbH. Legislación estadounidense • United States Congress. (2018). Agricultural Improvement Act of	Monitoring Programme Implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.	Monitoring Programme Implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Social	United States		Risk Assessment Summary A sector-level (Pathway 2) risk assessment was conducted for soy produced in the United States, differentiating two regions: Corn Belt: classified as a low-risk area, given that over 97% of the area planted with soy corresponds to agricultural land established prior to 1990, with no evidence of deforestation or conversion after 2020. Great Plains: classified as a moderate-risk area, due to documented conversion of native grasslands over recent decades, albeit under state legal frameworks (legal conversion). ii. Risk Assessment Outcome (risk by factor) Legality: Low risk (compliance	Normativa internacional y estándares • Aquaculture Stewardship Council. (2023). ASC Feed Standard V1.01. Utrecht, Países Bajos: ASC. • FEFAC. (2021). Soy Sourcing Guidelines 2021. Brussels, Bélgica: European Feed Manufacturers' Federation. • ProTerra Foundation. (2025). ProTerra Standard v5.0. Rotterdam, Países Bajos: ProTerra Foundation. • RTRS – Round Table on Responsible Soy. (2021). RTRS Standard for Responsible Soy Production. Buenos Aires, Argentina: RTRS. • ISCC. (2023). ISCC PLUS Sustainability Requirements. Cologne, Alemania: ISCC System GmbH. Legislación estadounidense • United States Congress. (2018). Agricultural Improvement Act of	Monitoring Programme Implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.	Monitoring Programme Implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.
Pathway 2 Sector/Industry/Fishery assessment	Plant Primary Raw Material	2025-12-31	Soy bean (Glycine max)	Environmental	United States		Risk Assessment Summary A sector-level (Pathway 2) risk assessment was conducted for soy produced in the United States, differentiating two regions: Corn Belt: classified as a low-risk area, given that over 97% of the area planted with soy corresponds to agricultural land established prior to 1990, with no evidence of deforestation or conversion after 2020. Great Plains: classified as a moderate-risk area, due to documented conversion of native grasslands over recent decades, albeit under state legal frameworks (legal conversion). ii. Risk Assessment Outcome (risk by factor) Legality: Low risk (compliance	Normativa internacional y estándares • Aquaculture Stewardship Council. (2023). ASC Feed Standard V1.01. Utrecht, Países Bajos: ASC. • FEFAC. (2021). Soy Sourcing Guidelines 2021. Brussels, Bélgica: European Feed Manufacturers' Federation. • ProTerra Foundation. (2025). ProTerra Standard v5.0. Rotterdam, Países Bajos: ProTerra Foundation. • RTRS – Round Table on Responsible Soy. (2021). RTRS Standard for Responsible Soy Production. Buenos Aires, Argentina: RTRS. • ISCC. (2023). ISCC PLUS Sustainability Requirements. Cologne, Alemania: ISCC System GmbH. Legislación estadounidense • United States Congress. (2018). Agricultural Improvement Act of	Monitoring Programme Implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.	Monitoring Programme Implemented Soy purchased from known Corn Belt origin, with the additional requirement that it holds SSAP certification.
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Ingredient Manufacturer	2025-12-31	Wheat	Legal	Honduras		All the evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's risk assessment (Pathway 3) was reviewed and evaluated, confirming that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway are effective in classifying suppliers across the three areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In addition, it was possible to identify potential improvement points based on the weighted risk obtained for each question; for example, any question with a weighted risk other than 0 must be addressed ahead of the next assessment in order to improve the supplier's score. Furthermore, the complete assessment of the supplier Molino Harinero Sula S.A., carried out through Pathway 3 of the Due Diligence process,		As part of the risk assessment process for the supplier Molino Harinero Sula S.A., it is essential to continuously monitor any change or update to the information contained in this report. The main tasks for the next assessment are set out below, with their dates and responsible party. Activity 1: Share the Pathway 3 assessment results with the supplier. Justification: To provide feedback on the process and explain the significance of the points that obtained a weighted risk other than 0. Date: 6 months from the issue date of this report. Responsible: Quality Manager – Honduras. Activity 2: Review updates to the documents submitted as	
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Ingredient Manufacturer	2025-12-31	Wheat	Social	Honduras		All the evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's risk assessment (Pathway 3) was reviewed and evaluated, confirming that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway are effective in classifying suppliers across the three areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In addition, it was possible to identify potential improvement points based on the weighted risk obtained for each question; for example, any question with a weighted risk other than 0 must be addressed ahead of the next assessment in order to improve the supplier's score. Furthermore, the complete assessment of the supplier Molino Harinero Sula S.A., carried out through Pathway 3 of the Due Diligence process,		As part of the risk assessment process for the supplier Molino Harinero Sula S.A., it is essential to continuously monitor any change or update to the information contained in this report. The main tasks for the next assessment are set out below, with their dates and responsible party. Activity 1: Share the Pathway 3 assessment results with the supplier. Justification: To provide feedback on the process and explain the significance of the points that obtained a weighted risk other than 0. Date: 6 months from the issue date of this report. Responsible: Quality Manager – Honduras. Activity 2: Review updates to the documents submitted as	
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Ingredient Manufacturer	2025-12-31	Wheat	Environmental	Honduras		All the evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's risk assessment (Pathway 3) was reviewed and evaluated, confirming that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway are effective in classifying suppliers across the three areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In addition, it was possible to identify potential improvement points based on the weighted risk obtained for each question; for example, any question with a weighted risk other than 0 must be addressed ahead of the next assessment in order to improve the supplier's score. Furthermore, the complete assessment of the supplier Molino Harinero Sula S.A., carried out through Pathway 3 of the Due Diligence process,		As part of the risk assessment process for the supplier Molino Harinero Sula S.A., it is essential to continuously monitor any change or update to the information contained in this report. The main tasks for the next assessment are set out below, with their dates and responsible party. Activity 1: Share the Pathway 3 assessment results with the supplier. Justification: To provide feedback on the process and explain the significance of the points that obtained a weighted risk other than 0. Date: 6 months from the issue date of this report. Responsible: Quality Manager – Honduras. Activity 2: Review updates to the documents submitted as	

Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Ingredient Manufacturer	2026-12-31	Wheat	Legal	Honduras		All the evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's risk assessment (Pathway 3) was reviewed and evaluated, confirming that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway are effective in classifying suppliers across the three areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation returned the following scores for the risks referred to above: Legal (questions 1 and 2): weighted risk 0. Social (questions 3 to 15): weighted risk 3 (arising from question 13). Environmental (questions 16 to 28): weighted risk 12 (arising from questions 18 and 24). Total: 15.		As part of the risk assessment process for Grupo Jaremar de Honduras, it is essential to continuously monitor any update to the information in this report. The main tasks for the next assessment are set out below. Activity 1: Share the Pathway 3 assessment results with the supplier. Justification: To provide feedback and explain the significance of the points that obtained a weighted risk other than 0. Date: 6 months from the issue date of this report. Responsible: Quality Manager – Honduras. Activity 2: Review updates to the documents submitted as evidence, including operating permits (particularly environmental permit 181-2014 and fire certificate HBCBH017-	
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Ingredient Manufacturer	2026-12-31	Wheat	Social	Honduras		All the evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's risk assessment (Pathway 3) was reviewed and evaluated, confirming that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway are effective in classifying suppliers across the three areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation returned the following scores for the risks referred to above: Legal (questions 1 and 2): weighted risk 0. Social (questions 3 to 15): weighted risk 3 (arising from question 13). Environmental (questions 16 to 28): weighted risk 12 (arising from questions 18 and 24). Total: 15.		As part of the risk assessment process for Grupo Jaremar de Honduras, it is essential to continuously monitor any update to the information in this report. The main tasks for the next assessment are set out below. Activity 1: Share the Pathway 3 assessment results with the supplier. Justification: To provide feedback and explain the significance of the points that obtained a weighted risk other than 0. Date: 6 months from the issue date of this report. Responsible: Quality Manager – Honduras. Activity 2: Review updates to the documents submitted as evidence, including operating permits (particularly environmental permit 181-2014 and fire certificate HBCBH017-	
Pathway 3 Ingredient Manufacturer assessment	Ingredient Manufacturer	2026-12-31	Wheat	Environmental	Honduras		All the evidence submitted for each question answered in the supplier's risk assessment (Pathway 3) was reviewed and evaluated, confirming that the methodology and tool developed for this pathway are effective in classifying suppliers across the three areas relevant to ASC: social risk, legal risk and environmental risk. In summary, the calculation returned the following scores for the risks referred to above: Legal (questions 1 and 2): weighted risk 0. Social (questions 3 to 15): weighted risk 3 (arising from question 13). Environmental (questions 16 to 28): weighted risk 12 (arising from questions 18 and 24). Total: 15.		As part of the risk assessment process for Grupo Jaremar de Honduras, it is essential to continuously monitor any update to the information in this report. The main tasks for the next assessment are set out below. Activity 1: Share the Pathway 3 assessment results with the supplier. Justification: To provide feedback and explain the significance of the points that obtained a weighted risk other than 0. Date: 6 months from the issue date of this report. Responsible: Quality Manager – Honduras. Activity 2: Review updates to the documents submitted as evidence, including operating permits (particularly environmental permit 181-2014 and fire certificate HBCBH017-	

Report title	**Volume of Marine Ingredients and MSL Report, v1.0**
Indicators	**4.1.5 and 4.1.6**

Instructions

This template is intended for reporting UoC volume of marine ingredients used and majority sustainability level (MSL) to ASC.
For initial audits, the calculation period is the 24 months prior to the initial audit. After initial certification, the calculation period is per calendar year (January to December).
Indicate the volume of whole fish and by-products in metric tonnes, used in aquafeed.
Indicate the volume of whole fish scoring at each category in aquafeed. Note that there may be whole-fish which does not score at any Category.
The MSL is then calculated.
Only enter data in blue cells.

Table 1. Volume of whole fish, by-products and whole fish by category

	Volume (metric tonnes)	
All marine	1207	
By-products	439	Provide the volume of fishery by-products in aquafeed (metric tonne)
Whole fish	768	Provide the volume of whole fish in aquafeed (metric tonne)
Category 1	0	Provide the volume of Category 1 whole fish included in aquafeed (metric tonne)
Category 2	530	Provide the volume of Category 2 whole fish included in aquafeed (metric tonne)
Category 3	238	Provide the volume of Category 3 whole fish included in aquafeed (metric tonne)
Category 4	0	Provide the volume of Category 4 whole fish included in aquafeed (metric tonne)

Table 2. Percentage of whole fish marine ingredients per category

Category	Percentage (%)	
Category 1	0	This is the percentage of whole fish marine ingredients in Category 1
Category 2	69	This is the percentage of whole fish marine ingredients in Category 2
Category 3	31	This is the percentage of whole fish marine ingredients in Category 3
Category 4	0	This is the percentage of whole fish marine ingredients in Category 4

Majority Sustainability Level	Level 2